

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH
CENTRAL DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,

vs.

HEDTHEL MAURICIO CORLETO,
Defendant.

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR EARLY
TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED
RELEASE

Case No. 2:08-CR-585 TS

This matter is before the Court for consideration of Defendant's Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release. For the reasons discussed below, the Court will grant the Motion.

I. BACKGROUND

Defendant was indicted, on August 27, 2008, on charges of smuggling, dealing in firearms without a license, and false statement during the acquisition of a firearm. Defendant pleaded guilty to Counts II and III on June 30, 2009. Defendant was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 12 months and 1 day, to be followed by 36 months of supervised released.

Defendant's term of supervised release began on November 16, 2010. Defendant now moves to terminate that supervision. The government has indicated that it does not object to the Motion.

In his Motion, Defendant states that he has been compliant with all terms of his supervised release, that he is gainfully employed, and that he has not had any problems abiding by the law. Defendant's supervising officer confirms that Defendant has been cooperative and compliant with the terms of his supervised release, maintained a stable residence and employment, and paid his special assessment fee. Defendant's supervising officer further reports that, during home visits, no evidence of criminal conduct has been observed and a criminal records check revealed no new arrests or outstanding warrants.

II. DISCUSSION

18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) permits the Court to terminate supervised release at any time after a defendant has completed at least one year of supervised release, but prior to completion of the entire term, if the Court is satisfied that such action is (1) warranted by the conduct of an offender and (2) is in the interest of justice. In making this determination, the Court is directed to consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), to the extent they are applicable.

Having considered these factors, reviewed the docket and case file, and consulted with Defendant's supervising officer, the Court finds that early termination of Defendant's term of supervised release is both warranted by the conduct of the offender and in the interest of justice.

III. CONCLUSION

It is therefore


ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release (Docket No. 66) is GRANTED. It is further

ORDERED that Defendant's term of supervised release shall be terminated effective immediately and this case shall be closed.

SO ORDERED.

DATED February 23, 2012.

BY THE COURT:



TED STEWART
United States District Judge